

**Washington State Department of Transportation**

**Public Transportation and Rail Division**

**Office of Transit Mobility**

**Advisory Committee Meeting**

**WSDOT Urban Corridors Office**

February 3, 2006  
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

**Attendees:** Martha Rose, Island Transit; Paul Kaftanski, City of Everett; Joy Munkers, Community Transit; Charlie Howard, PSRC; T.J. Nedrow, WSDOT; Jemae Hoffman, City of Seattle; Leo Bowman, Ben Franklin Transit; Marty Minkoff, Sound Transit; Wendy Clark-Getzin, Kitsap Transit; Kevin Murphy, PSRC; Judy Giniger, WSDOT; Theresa Smith, WSDOT; Janice Hamil, WSDOT  
*Teleconferencing:* John Hoefs, C-TRAN; Kim Van Eckstrom, City of Redmond; Peter Thein, WSTA

**Handouts:**

*Regional Mobility Grant Program 20056-2007 Recommended Project List*  
*I-405 Construction Mitigation TDM Work Plan Summary*  
Letter from Timothy Frederickson of Ben Franklin Transit  
*2006 Household Activity Survey Status Update*

**Goal of Today's Meeting**

Debrief on grant process and set goals for the future of the Office of Transit Mobility.

**Update on Regional Mobility Grant Program**

Overview of Final Recommendations

Judy Giniger opened the meeting with introductions and a run-through of the agenda. She then spoke about the Regional Mobility Grant Program and the presentation to the Senate Transportation Committee. She pointed out that there probably won't be a House hearing on the grant program. There was discussion of the questions that came up in the hearing, including the passenger-only ferry issue.

Committee members wondered when we will know which projects are being awarded. The money will be put into the supplemental budget and we'll know during that process. Another question was asked about the initiative to repeal the

weight fees. The answer is that we can't really speculate, but money has already been collected and may fund the first year of projects. There is no refund provision in the initiative.

### **Debrief on process**

#### What worked?

Members felt positive about the process and that a lot of time and energy was devoted for a short, intense period of time. Members appreciated this speed because it made it feel as though their limited time was appreciated. The speed of the process kept their time commitments minimal.

Members also appreciated that there was a focus on higher ideals and not so much the dollar amount available. Members thought this made it more like a team effort - there is a perception that there isn't much transit money from the State and it was an opportunity to fix that perception. The sharp focus on criteria kept personal feelings out of the mix.

Committee members also felt that each member of both committees understood the responsibility of their committee (policy vs. technical) and focused on their own arena so that no one was excluded. They also were impressed that there was a good balance of people, backgrounds & expertise.

#### What needs to change?

There was discussion about changes that could be implemented for next year's go-round. It sometimes seemed as if there was a bit of a disconnect between the committees, because the technical group needed policy decisions in order to make some decisions of their own. In other words, debriefing of policy decisions could happen sooner in the process. A way to fix this would be to have more communication between committees by having a few more members representing the other committee on each. This might also alleviate some concerns about geographic bias.

#### Next steps for 2007 project selection process:

Members felt more time was needed to review the consistency of applications received. The time saving idea of breaking into separate groups to go over applications wasn't really helpful because each group may have applied the criteria differently. Our strength is in our diversity of views, but as a whole committee, not smaller groups. Some members felt the weighting of the criteria kind of fell through the cracks and didn't get the attention it deserved. They also felt that the definition of completion expectations was a little too vague and should address issues such as, what do we do with a project that isn't moving along, and how do we track and enforce this? This spurred discussion about a possible "failure withdrawal" clause, how to deal with phasing of projects and maximum grant requests.

#### Should the Advisory Committee assume the technical review role or should we bring the Grant Technical Work Group back?

Everyone agreed that the two committees filled two roles that were necessary. A meeting between the two committees to review criteria before starting the next round of grants is really needed. The members also were generally very positive about the division of labor, wanting the technical work group to again score and rank the project applications, with the advisory committee in the role of auditing the process. Several members felt it was important to not second-guess the rankings, but review them carefully.

### **2006 WSDOT/PSRC Household Survey**

Kevin Murphy presented the goals of the 2006 Survey. The major difference between the upcoming survey and the one done in 1999 is the goal to include transit users specifically. It will also include “tour” data instead of just “start to end” trips. There was some discussion and a question-and-answer session.

### **Next steps for Implementation of SHB 2124 - the Office of Transit Mobility**

We would like to focus on long-range transit planning, and really need to include TDM. We also have a great opportunity to tie into the CTR legislation going through the Legislature now, and help direct it in the way it should go, including partnering with PSRC, and the MPOs.

Members agreed that more drilled-down scales of land-use mapping will help a lot with planning and be able to formulate more of a geographic response. Several members wondered whether there were other forums to address LR planning that we could partner with. Most members felt strongly that this group needs to facilitate the discussion with PSRC and other regional councils. They need to be involved in statewide transit planning with the transit agencies, whose plans need to connect/relate to local comp plans. Committee members also agreed that we need real numbers from market-based planning.

### **Statewide Park & Ride**

Some members thought that the planning should include bus layovers as that is a major issue in some areas with overcrowded park and rides. The members agree that we need a working group to “frame up” the issues and goals and bring back to the whole committee for review. This then could lay the groundwork for working with the long-range planning group, while identifying things that can be done immediately.

### **Performance Objective Requirements**

Committee members felt that this should be tackled by the whole committee.

Set up meeting for March after the 9th (sine die)